

Hope persists that an acceptable compromise can be found between Moscow's stand for inspection of all non-nuclear countries by the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna and the insistence of America's West European allies that inspection in their countries be continued by their own agency, Euratom. Even such a compromise may not completely resolve the control issue, however, as shown by Rumania's demand that the nuclear powers should also be subject to inspection.

Apart from a control system, much missionary work will remain to persuade non-nuclear countries that adherence to the treaty will neither consign them to second-class industrial status nor leave them vulnerable to nuclear blackmail.

In an earlier stage at Geneva, Brazil argued that to bar a country from carrying out its own peaceful atomic explosions in earth-moving and construction would be to damage its entire technology. This week India—ever conscious of China's nuclear weapons progress—again asked for a multilateral guarantee of protection for non-nuclear signatories.

These problems are not insurmountable, but they are substantial enough to rule out premature celebration. Recognition of their importance in no way detracts from the considerable—perhaps monumental—achievement at Geneva.

American-Soviet agreement on even an incomplete treaty constitutes evidence that the world's two nuclear super-powers can recognize a powerful common interest despite their bitter and perilous disagreements on Vietnam and the Middle East. Great-power responsibility of this high order, if translated into other fields, could mean a mighty step toward that minimum security in a nuclear world without which there can be no assured future for anyone.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 25, 1967]

NUCLEAR TREATY

The long years of negotiations with the Soviet Union since the end of World War II have taught us to be skeptical about agreements "in principle" or about treaties relating to arms controls which have no inspection or enforcement clauses. There have been too many instances in which no agreement could be reached about the fine print. Yet the treaty halting nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere was finally signed, without inspection-enforcement provisions which once had been considered essential, and its general effects have been beneficial, even though France and Red China refused to sign and have gone on with their own tests.

The draft treaty designed to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, which has been under discussion for months in Geneva, logically follows the treaty on nuclear testing in the atmosphere. Its intent is to apply international controls to these awesome weapons and to allow man to edge a little farther away from the shadow of the mushroom cloud.

For the moment, however, the draft treaty on which the United States and the Soviet Union can agree—and which other governments will be asked to agree—is incomplete in a vital point. This is the proposed Article 3, which would deal with inspection of the signatory governments' civilian nuclear facilities. This part of the draft treaty, which has been under negotiation for months, is being left blank.

There still is a difference of opinion as to whether the inspection system should be uniform for all signatories or whether the members of Euratom—the atomic energy agency of the European Economic Community which of course includes West Germany—should maintain their own system and be excluded from other inspection. This involves, in substance, the question of whether one group would be allowed to inspect itself.

A draft treaty with one article missing is only a step toward an agreement. The American and Soviet governments seem to regard it as a significant step. Let us hope so. But let us be realistic about the work still to be done.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—THE CIA AND NSA CONTROVERSY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I do not believe that the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency should be completely exempted from the provisions of the bill, S. 1035, protecting the privacy and other constitutional rights of Federal employees.

We have been giving this matter our most careful study and consideration during the past 3 years, when the bill was in the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I am a member.

The chairman of that subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], has been in almost constant touch with all the agencies of our Government having to do with national security questions. After a most exhaustive analysis of the whole picture, the subcommittee adopted amendments to the bill exempting the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and granting a partial exemption to the CIA and NSA.

This limited exemption provides that the practices outlawed by the bill, such as lie detector tests and psychological tests, may be used only in situations involving the national security.

I strongly agree with Senator ERVIN that all Federal employees should be accorded the protection of their privacy and basic rights, regardless of the mission of the agency for which they happen to work.

The CIA and NSA have had ample opportunity to present their views and discuss their problems with the subcommittee over these last 3 years. To raise objections to the bill at the 11th hour is to me only an attempt to kill the legislation.

SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR PRIVATE PLANES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to speak in the Senate on the need for establishing weather-monitoring stations and providing crash location beacons for private aircraft. Recently an excellent article, which analyzes at some depth the rash of crashes in our Colorado mountains, was written by Mr. Dan Partner, a Denver Post staff writer, and published in the Post of August 20, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RASH OF CRASHES: WEATHER, TERRAIN, AND ERRORS CLAIM LIGHT PLANES IN COLORADO

(By Dan Partner)

Flying conditions for light airplanes in Colorado have been described as the roughest of any state, Alaska excepted. "If you can fly in Colorado," veteran pilots say, "you can fly anywhere."

Pilot error, the hostile terrain of Colorado's

Rockies and "quick change" weather are often co-pilots of death on light aircraft.

Colorado's crashes came in bunches. Last year there was a rash of accidents in June. This year August is the bad month.

Actually, Colorado's flying safety record compares favorably with the fair-weather states of Arizona and California—a high tribute to the approximately 10,000 pilots and an exceptional group of flying instructors.

Despite the hazards, Colorado pilots are maintaining a safety record equal to those of the eight other Western states, according to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) statistics. California, for example, had 56.6 per cent of the aircraft and 60.7 per cent of the airmen in the nine-state area in 1965. It accounted for 50 per cent of the total accidents, 48 per cent of the fatal accidents and 48.3 per cent of the fatalities. Arizona had 7.2 per cent of the aircraft, 5.5 per cent of the airmen and accounted for 8.5 per cent of the total accidents, 9.6 per cent of the fatal accidents, and 11 per cent of the fatalities.

Colorado had 6 per cent of the aircraft, 7 per cent of the airmen and contributed 8 per cent of the accidents, 7.4 per cent of the fatal accidents and 5.7 per cent of the fatalities. The state of Washington had a 10 per cent figure across the board. The 1965 figures are the last available for the Western states.

Colorado's fatality figure can, in part, be "credited" to visitors unaware that mountain flying requires a special set of rules. A five-year study of general aviation flying in Colorado, 1962-66 inclusive, by the FAA revealed out-of-state pilots were involved in 26.1 per cent of the accidents during the period and accounted for 40 per cent of the fatal accidents.

(General aviation includes all flying except the commercial planes and military. An accident is recorded if damage requires \$300 or more for repairs.)

CALIFORNIANS LEAD

California-based pilots were the leading out-of-state contributors to the Colorado accident toll during the five-year period, having 25 crashes with five fatalities. Eighteen Texas planes crashed, killing five. Planes from other states crashing in Colorado included Kansas, 15 accidents, 2 killed; Nebraska 14, 1 killed; New Mexico 16, 2 killed; and Wyoming, 10, 2 killed.

The study, made by the FAA's General Aviation District office, headed by Robert H. Lewis, revealed these Colorado totals:

Year:	Fatal		
	Accidents	accidents	Fatalities
1962 -----	109	18	37
1963 -----	121	16	30
1964 -----	109	16	42
1965 -----	102	10	16
1966 -----	140	17	33
Totals --	581	77	158

Of the 581 accidents, 67.6 per cent were attributed to pilots error, 13.9 per cent to mechanical trouble and 18.5 per cent to other factors, such as severe winds, turbulence and conditions over which the pilot had no control. It was found that while only 22 percent of the accidents occurred during the cruise phase of flight, 81.8 per cent of the fatal accidents happened during this phase.

The recent spurt in accidents, FAA officials fear, had ruined chances of holding the 1967 total to the 140 recorded last year. The pace appeared favorable from Jan. 1 to June 30 as 69 accidents were recorded, four of them fatal for eight persons. Since July 1, however, there have been 20 accidents and 10 persons have died in four of them.

While the current accident rate is not regarded as "alarming," FAA officials are stepping up their safety programs designed